IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 8442 of 2026

Dinesh Prasad aged about 55 years, S/o late Churman Kumhar Resident of village: Mahto Tola Laiyo, Post Office and Police Station: Mandu (W.B.), District: Ramgarh (Jharkhand) **… … Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand **… … Opp. Party**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Kripa Shankar Nanda, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Nawin Kumar Singh, APP
For the Informant : Ms. Sarweshwari Kumari, Advocate

03/**07.10.2026** Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody in connection with S.T. Case No. 75 of 2026, Mandu (W.B.) P.S. Case No. 09 of 2026 (G.R. No. 213 of 2026) for the offences registered under Sections 80(2)/3(5) of the B.N.S 2023, pending in the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-I-cum-Special Judge, FTC, Ramgarh.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 23.03.2026 and he is the father-in-law of the deceased. He has submitted that there is no specific allegation against the petitioner and his daughter-in-law has committed suicide. The main reason for commission of suicide was that the victim had suspicion that her husband who was working at Simdega had illicit relation with someone else.

4. Learned counsel for the opposite party-State and the informant have opposed the prayer for bail and have submitted that the deceased died in her matrimonial home in which father-in-law and mother-in-law were living and within one year of marriage, the victim was found dead in an unnatural condition and there is also an allegation of demand of dowry as is apparent from the FIR itself. They have submitted that at this stage, the petitioner may not be enlarged on bail.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the fact that the deceased died in her matrimonial home and there is an allegation of demand of dowry, this court is not

inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, prayer for bail of the petitioner above named is rejected.

6. Let this order be communicated to the concerned court through FAX/e-mail.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Dated: 07.10.2026

Uploaded on 09.10.2026

Binit/